

Appl. No. 09/979,530
Attr. Docket No. AA406M
Amdt. dated December 8, 2003
Reply to Office Action of 09/29/2003
Customer No. 27752

REMARKS

Claims 5-11 and 15-20 are pending in the present application. No additional claims fee is believed to be due.

Claims 1-4 and 12-14 are canceled without prejudice.

Claims 5 and 15 have been amended to be rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of their respective previous base claims and any respective previous intervening claims.

Claims 6-8, 10, 16-17, and 19-20 have been amended to correct their dependency, in response to the above-noted cancellation of Claims 1-4 and 12-14.

Claims 7, 9 and 18 have been amended to correct inadvertent typographical errors.

It is believed these changes do not involve any introduction of new matter. Consequently, entry of these changes is believed to be in order and is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Office Action states "Claims 5 and 15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims."

Claims 5 and 15 have been amended as suggested by the Office Action.

Rejection Under 35 USC 102 Over DE 195 24 287 A1 ("Henkel")

Claims 12, 13, 16, 17, 18 and 20 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by DE 195 24 287 A1 ("Henkel"). Claims 12-13 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 16-18 and 20, in view of the amendments set forth above, now incorporate all the limitations of amended Claim 15; and are therefore believed to be novel and non-obvious over Henkel.

Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a) Over DE 195 24 287 A1 ("Henkel")

Claims 1-4, 6-14 and 16-20 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henkel. Claims 1-4 and 12-14 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 6-11 and 19, in view of the amendments set forth above, now incorporate all the limitations of

Appl. No. 09/979,530
Atty. Docket No. AA406M
Amdt. dated December 8, 2003
Reply to Office Action of 09/29/2003
Customer No. 27752


amended Claim 5; and are therefore believed to be non-obvious over Henkel. Claims 16-18 and 20, in view of the amendments set forth above, now incorporate all the limitations of amended Claim 15; and are therefore believed to be non-obvious over Henkel.

Conclusion

Applicants have made an earnest effort to place their application in proper form and to distinguish the invention as now claimed from the applied references. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application, entry of the amendments presented herein, and allowance of Claims 5-11 and 15-20.

Respectfully submitted,
G. Jagannath, et al.

By


Brahm J. Corstanje
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 34,804
(513) 627-7533

December 8, 2003
Customer No. 27752